



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/673,235	12/01/2000	Masaaki Ishida	P100725-0017	9089

7590

04/07/2003

Arent Fox Kintner
Plotkin & Kahn
Suite 600
1050 Connecticut Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20036-5339

EXAMINER

IP, SIKYIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1742

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/673,235			

EXAMINER	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	11

DATE MAILED:

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

☐ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

- a) ☐ is extended to run _____ or continues to run _____ from the date of the final rejection
- b) ☐ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

☒ Appellant's response to the final rejection, filed 3/24/03, has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. ☐ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
- a. ☐ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
- b. ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
- c. ☐ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
- d. ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
- e. ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE:

2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

3. ☒ Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment ☒ will be entered ☐ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: none

Claims objected to: none

Claims rejected: 1-7, 14, 15

However;

☒ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 USC § 112 rejections.

Applicant's argument with respect to Yamada is noted. But as is arises by JP '711, Cr-Si steel is known to be surface hardening by peening and nitridation.

4. ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because of reasons set forth in Paper No. 8. Applicant's argument as set forth in paragraph bridging pages 12 and 13 of the instant remarks is
5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.

☐ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the examiner.

☐ Other ** noted. First, JP '711 is cited to show shot peening followed by nitridation of Cr-Si steel is known. Second, the peening particle size of JP '711 is in the same range of Iizawa (col. 4, lines 25-49) which is conventional. Third, 100 µm diameter peening particles is allowed in instant claims.*

PTOL-303 (REV. 5-89)

U.S. GPO: 1997-417-381/52704

SKYIN IP
PRIMARY EXAMINER